

**CONSOLIDATION COMMITTEE  
P.O. BOX 71114  
FAIRBANKS, AK. 99707**

**REPLY BRIEF  
SECTION 1**

**Reply Brief to the Responsive Brief filed by the Fairbanks North Star Borough to the Local Boundary Commission dated July 28, 2000.**

The Petitioners will reply to the comments contained in Brief of the Fairbanks North Star Borough that was filed in opposition to the proposed consolidation. We will summarize the borough statements and comment where we disagree as follows:

**Introduction**

The Borough states consolidation would neither improve the delivery of services nor reduce their cost and it would diminish the level of self-government for City residents.

**Reply:** The 39-page City and Borough Consolidation Budget and Fiscal Comments submitted with the Petitioners Reply Brief reports the City's lack of administrative depth becomes one of cost effectiveness and efficiency that would be solved with consolidation. The new budget shows net savings of \$578,723 and states "Consolidation offers the potential to effect long-term direct cost savings, or general improvements in overall local government efficiency, beyond just those that result from combining overlapping departments and functions".

City residents are also Borough residents; they elect Borough officials now and after consolidation. This is self-government improved by consolidation eliminating the cost of City residents supporting two local governments. Unification in Anchorage did not diminish the level of self-government for former city residents.

**Petition for Consolidation**

The Borough states present City residents, under Consolidation, will no longer live in the City of Fairbanks, the "Golden Heart City" instead they will call "Urban Service Area" home. The Borough states the City loses its Home Rule powers and the transition will cost \$5 million dollars and will have a negative impact on economic development funding. (The 10-mill tax cap has been addressed in the Petitioners cover letter to the LBC)

**Reply:** City residents, under consolidation, will live in the "Municipality of Fairbanks", as they do now. Just because borough residents may reside in one of 117 existing service areas, they don't call Ester Lump, Hopeless, Loose Moose or Serendipity "Home." (Names of 4 borough service areas) How silly! They live in "Fairbanks".

The Consolidation Petition provides for City residents to retain all the current powers they enjoy now but will respond to, and pay for, just one local government.

There will be one-time transition costs, what those costs will be depends on how thrifty or extravagant the new Municipality conducts the transition.

Consolidation will not have a negative impact on economic development. The Consolidation Petition calls for the new Municipality to expand economic development to the new Urban Service Area, thus expanding the Borough's economic development area, a positive move.

### **Constitutional standards for local government in Alaska**

The Borough attempts to argue that the Alaska Constitution does not allow for Consolidation of Cities and Boroughs and that Section 1 of Article X states, in part, "The purpose of the article is to provide for maximum local self-government with a minimum of local government units..."

**Reply:** The Borough neglects (purposely?) to complete Section 1 wherein it adds "**and to prevent duplication of tax-levying jurisdictions.**" (Emphasis added)

The Borough further tries to justify their stance that a city cannot become a service area quoting Section 5, Article X of the Alaska Constitution; "A new service area shall not be established if, consistent with the purposes of the article, the new service area can be provided by an existing service area, by incorporations as a city, or by annexation to a city."

**Reply:** In 1970, when the Juneau Borough unified, both the City of Juneau and the City of Douglas each became a service area of the new municipality. When challenged, the court ruled in that regard that: "Unification is consistent with the purpose expressed in Article X section 1 of minimizing the number of local government units. Article X, section 2 merely authorizes but does not require the coexistence of cities and boroughs." Both the City of Anchorage and the City of Sitka became service areas of the new Boroughs when those municipalities unified. The Petitioners believe the same standards apply to Consolidation.

Further the Constitutional convention delegates who designed Alaska's system of local government considered a borough without cities to be the optimum form of local government.

### **Consolidation will not promote maximum local self-government with a minimum of local government units**

Maybe the Borough can't count! Obviously dissolving two government units and forming one municipality does create a minimum of local government units. The Borough has 117 service areas now with a multitude of services and adding another service area increases the service areas to 118, but it reduces by 50% the number of municipalities with elected and appointed officials.

The Consolidation Petition stated the new Assembly may propose the election or appointment of a service area governing board. The Petitioners believe the new Municipal Mayor and his or her staff can easily manage the new Urban Service Area. The Mayor of Anchorage manages a population three times larger than the entire Fairbanks North Star Borough. Surely, talent exists in Fairbanks to manage a new consolidated municipality.

The residents of the former City of Anchorage, now a service district, have seen the former city blossom with unification and they now deal with just one jurisdiction instead of two. That is providing the maximum local self-government with the minimum of local government units!

### **The Alaska Constitution prefers the incorporated City of Fairbanks over establishment of an Urban Service Area**

**Reply:** The Borough is beating a dead horse! The Alaska Constitution says no such thing! This issue was discussed in the previous reply. If what the Borough is saying was true, the courts would have disallowed the previous unification of the Juneau, Sitka and Anchorage Boroughs some 30 years ago.

### **Statutory incorporation standards**

(The Local Boundary Commission should note the Borough's statement "**that the population of the area is interrelated and integrated as to its social, cultural and economic activities**" whereas the City of Fairbanks on pages 14 –16 of their Responsive Brief states this is one section of concern that does not meet statutory requirements.)

### **Anticipated Functions**

**Reply:** The Borough jests with the statement "the Petitioners look to the "stable and respected Borough Administration and Assembly" to manage the new Urban Service Area efficiently, effectively and economically." Compared to the City administration, this is fact evidenced by the Petitioners updated consolidated budget analysis and the Boroughs own analysis of current city administration problems.

The Borough states Economic Development would suffer in the new Urban Service Area under Consolidation. The Borough states the hotel bed tax, an area-wide tax, cannot be used for Economic Development, a non-areawide function.

**Reply:** Economic Development in the borough is not funded by the bed tax, it is funded by the general fund. The Carlson Center can continue to be funded by the Borough's bed tax under Consolidation.

The present city bed tax disposition raises another issue. Under the City tax cap, as hotel tax revenues rise, property taxes decrease. New hotels are being developed in the city and as hotel bed revenues go up, and dispersed to non-profit groups, the property taxes available for city operations decrease. The City of Fairbanks is slowly self-destructing under this scenario. The City Council should assure essential public safety issues, police, fire, streets and walks are attended to prior to giving blank checks to non-profit groups who, prior to the bed tax, provided volunteer funding and staffing.

### **Anticipated Expenses and Income**

The Borough correctly questions the Petitioners two page consolidated budget. The new 39-page City and Borough Consolidation Budget and Fiscal Comments submitted with the Petitioners Reply Brief addresses the several questions herein.

The Borough also correctly states that the City is currently understaffed by Borough standards as also addressed in the updated budget mentioned above.

The Consolidation Petition Transition Plan states the new assembly for the consolidated municipality **may** provide for an appointed or elected board to supervise the furnishing of special services in the new service area. (Emphasis added) The Petitioners have frequently referred to the Municipality of Anchorage wherein the Borough Mayor supervises the former City and Borough without an appointed or elected board. We would urge the new Municipality to follow other unified municipality's lead in borough management.

### **Budget Feasibility**

The Petitioners have submitted a new 39-page consolidation budget with their Responsive Briefs to the Local Boundary Commission. The Petitioners requested cooperation from the Fairbanks North Star Borough Mayor in developing the updated budget, but were denied cooperation since the Petitioners opposed extending the Public Notice period to December 15, 2000.

The Petitioners are also submitting with this Reply Brief, an attachment "Review of FNSB's Response Consolidation Budget by Petitioners for Consolidation of the City and Borough dated August 21, 2000".

The Local Boundary Commission should note that bureaucrats who oppose a proposal use whatever language they can to defeat the issue and that is precisely what the Borough administration is doing in this situation. The entire Responsive Brief could have been slanted on how Consolidation would benefit the Borough if Borough officials wanted the proposal to succeed. The Borough purposely left out all the pros and emphasized the cons. Vastly different than the positive attitude of elected and appointed officials from Haines and Ketchikan in their Consolidation proposals.

## **Transition**

### **The Petition does not include an adequate Transition Plan**

The Borough states the Consolidation Petition Transition Plan does not provide for the use of necessary ordinances to effect the transition. The Local Boundary Commission is invited to look at the first sentence on page 6 of the Transition Plan, which states “The new municipal assembly may adopt a new ordinance to address specific needs or conflicts”.

In reference to the City Permanent Fund, the petitioners are submitting a “Trust” for that fund to assure the Fund will be transferred for the use and benefit of the new Urban Service Area.

In reference to the Social Security 218 agreement, the new Municipality can apply for a new Social Security 218 agreement.

In reference to union contracts, the new Municipality has up to two years to resolve various labor issues. The Borough has had good labor relations and good labor negotiations in the past and with better labor negotiation leadership, these issues should pose no unreasonable task. It should be noted that when Anchorage unified they had far more serious labor issues, which were solved by officials that wanted to solve them.

### **Executive Plan**

The Borough again raised the issue of a necessary ordinance.

**Reply:** The first sentence on page 6 of the Transition Plan addresses this issue.

### **Election of assembly Members**

The Borough states the Consolidation Petitions method of election of Assembly members (Exhibit D Composition and Apportionment of the Assembly of the Proposed Municipality to be formed through Consolidation C. Election) is contrary to law.

**Reply:** We note this method of election of the Members of the Assembly, was used in the “Petition by the City of Haines and the Haines Borough for Consolidation as a Home Rule Borough” (Exhibit D. page 2). That Petition was approved by the Local Boundary commission and was submitted to the voters of the City of Haines and the Haines Borough. In the Ketchikan Consolidation Petition (Draft of 6/23/98) Article H, The Assembly, page 2 (c) the Assembly Members receiving the highest votes receive the longest initial terms.

If the Fairbanks North Star Borough is correct, and the Petitioners Petition is contrary to law, the Local Boundary Commission should stipulate how the initial Assembly Members are elected.

### **Other Transition Concerns**

**Reply:** The 10-mill Tax Cap was addressed in the Petitioners Reply Brief cover letter to the Local Boundary Commission.

The Petitioners did not feel it necessary to address the City and Borough Tax Caps since both municipalities have remained under the tax caps and the Consolidation Petitioners budget anticipates remaining under those tax caps.

The Transition costs have been addressed earlier in this Reply Brief.

The Consolidation Petitioners have used the existing City of Fairbanks boundaries for the new Urban Service Area and believe they are appropriate. The Boroughs Responsive Brief has not shown otherwise.

### **Capability to provide Municipal services**

**Reply:** The 10-mill tax cap has been addressed earlier.

### **Consolidation may affect the City and Borough Tax Caps**

**Reply:** As stated earlier, the Petitioners do not believe the City and Borough Tax Caps are an issue in the Consolidation Petition. It should be noted the Borough Tax Cap expires soon and the citizens have the right to impose a new 2-year Tax Cap on the Borough through a citizen's initiative. As also mentioned earlier, the City Tax Cap is slowly strangling the City's ability to provide essential services.

### **Petitioners have not budgeted for transition costs**

**Reply:** This issue was addressed earlier. The transition can take up to two years and be as thrifty or expensive as dictated by Borough management. The unified communities of Juneau, Sitka and Anchorage were able to accomplish merging local government without astronomical costs as projected by the Borough.

### **Summary**

The Borough repeats its negative position on the Consolidation Petition, going to great lengths to prove their point with no suggestions or constructive criticism how to more effectively consolidate two municipalities. The Borough Brief reinforces the Petitioners position that the City of Fairbanks does not provide the standards of governance practiced by the Borough. The Boroughs Responsive Brief points out many problem areas that would have to be addressed in consolidation.

The City of Fairbanks has gradually transferred local government responsibilities to the Borough, some through the Mandatory Borough Act, but most through the ability of the Borough to manage those functions in a more effective, responsive and efficient manner. The Area-wide functions that have been transferred include Public Schools, Assessment and Collection of Taxes, Planning, Platting and Land Use Regulations, Animal Control, Flood Control, Hospital (not exercised), Library, Air Pollution Control, Disaster and Civil Defense, Garbage and Solid Waste Disposal, Parks and Recreation, Transportation Systems, Day Care Assistance and Housing Financing.

The Borough operates comparable “City” powers in non-area-wide powers of Fireworks Control, Emergency Medical Services and Economic Development. The Borough provides Service Area powers including Road Construction and Maintenance, Fire protection, Water supply and Distribution, Sewage Disposal and Treatment, streetlights and Parks and Recreation.

With the sale of the Municipal Utilities (Water, Sewer, Telephone, Electric Power & Central Heating) the only power now exercised in the City that is not exercised in the Borough in some manner is Police Protection and Building Inspection.

The following was extrapolated from the Petitioners new “City and Borough Consolidation Budget and Fiscal Comments” submitted with the Petitioners Reply Brief:

“State Revenues continue to decline and being subject to serious annual revenue fluctuations decreases the City’s ability to provide the same level of services with meager cash reserves”.

“A review of the City’s Approved FY 2000 budget indicates an organization of principally three large functions, and several smaller ones. The City appears to operate these functions with a lack of centralized administrative depth within its organizational structure. With total expenditures in excess of \$22 million dollars and 173 full-time employees, there is only one centralized-shared position for both personnel and purchasing. This is just one example of the inadequate depth of centralized administrative support. At times the lack of administrative depth come at a high price to the taxpayers. A case in point is the recent \$2+ million settlement to two former firefighters, a settlement which is reflected in the current City budget by an increase in property taxes, as well as borrowing future PILOT tax-payments held in escrow. Some administrative issues mentioned in official city documents include the need for additional staffing and clearer definition of responsibilities in City finance, unresolved union contracts, weaknesses in internal controls, timely filing of grant reports so as not to have a negative effect on the City’s cash flows, and unresolved training grievances from 1998 impeding training efforts”.

“The lack of administrative depth becomes one of cost effectiveness and efficiency. The City’s operations appear to suffer from the lack of centralized administrative support, whether it be accounting practices, purchasing in bulk, personal computer technical

support, competitive bidding, employee hiring and management practices, training supervisors to appropriately manage their employees, sending out timely garbage bills, properly investing City monies, providing for major maintenance of building and equipment, apply for and reporting on grants in a timely manner, replacing outdated equipment, printing its approved budget, or preparing its financial reports in a timely manner”.

The Petitioners hold that Consolidation of the City of Fairbanks and the Fairbanks North Star Borough to a single municipality providing both urban and rural services, would be a positive move forward especially in light of continual reduced State revenues. The three unified municipalities, Juneau, Sitka & Anchorage would never revert to a divided, duplicated local government like exists in Fairbanks.

Over 4000 registered voters signed the Consolidation Petition to put the question on the ballot. While the Consolidation Petition may be brief in many areas, it was designed as a guide to a new Consolidated Municipality. We can only suggest actions and list the Petitions intent. We regret the Borough’s hostility to a citizen’s petition for what we believe would be better government. We also regret the reluctance of the Borough to recognize that over 31,000 Borough residents are supporting two administrations, where with a little help, those residents within a short time period could have what we have claimed all along, a more efficient, responsive and effective government at no additional cost, other than one time transition costs.

This concludes the Reply Brief to the Fairbanks North Star Borough Responsive Brief.



Review of FNSB's Response Consolidation Budget  
By Petitioners for Consolidation of the City and Borough  
Dated: August 21, 2000

## BACKGROUND

This report compares the Fairbanks North Star Borough's Consolidation Budget Response with that of the Petitioners' Consolidation Budget dated July 1, 2000.

To establish a basis for this comparison, several adjustments are required. First, corrections need to be made to the personnel roll-ups in the FNSB Response Budget in Section 2. Corrected pages are located in Appendix A of this report. As the corrections indicate the personnel numbers do not foot or tie out. The total personnel added to the FNSB's budgeted positions is 191.18 not 178.56. This correction brings the total staff, under the FNSB's consolidation budget, to 535.55 instead of 522.925. This is a total of 18.18 positions over the current City and Borough personnel combined total of 517.37.

The second adjustment that is required to put the two budget proposals on the same basis is to use approved budgeted personnel, expenditures and revenues for the City of Fairbanks. This was done in the Petitioners' budget presentation, however, was not done in the FNSB's budget proposal. In the comparative analysis of the two budgets, adjustments that are required to tie to the City's approved budget are noted.

City Approved FY 2000 budget numbers for personnel, expenditures and revenues are not used in the FNSB Response Budget; therefore, corrections are made in this review of these differences.

## SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

There is a net increase of 23.18 positions in the FNSB Response Budget over and above those included in the Petitioners' Budget, for a total additional cost of \$1,293,941. Of these 23.18 additional positions, five are Board of Supervisors members for the City (Urban) Service Area. The FNSB has added two new Director positions, namely a Computer Services Director and a Fire Chief. It has added 4 positions to Computer Services and 1.5 and 1.67 to each Financial Services and Law. Of concern are two new positions added for the City (Urban) Service Area for cashiering, billing, and collections' functions in addition to positions added for similar purposes in the Treasury and Budget Division and in Solid Waste Disposal.

The FNSB Response Consolidation Budget does not include 4.0 positions that are included in the Petitioners' Consolidation Budget for a cost of \$386,449. However, the FNSB budget does include 27.18 additional positions for a total cost of \$1,680,390. The net increase in positions is 23.18 for a total of \$1,293,941 in additional costs.

In other cost items (excluding transition costs), there are some significant changes proposed in the FNSB's Budget from that of the Petitioners'. The major changes are identified as follows:

<b>Summary of Major Changes</b>		
	<u><b>Personnel</b></u>	<u><b>Expenditures</b></u>
Personnel not included in FNSB Budget	(4.00)	\$ (386,449)
Personnel added in FNSB Budget	27.18	1,680,390
Additional Audit Fees		30,000
Code Supplement Added		20,000
City (Urban) Service Area Elections costs added		27,000
No additional contractual Attorney services budgeted		(75,000)
Claims Adjustor contract		20,000
Increase in Insurance & Bonding costs		168,035
Added back vehicle leases that FNSB Response deleted from City's Budget		(40,000)
City Community Economic Development Grants		(1,983,629)
Contingency not budgeted by Petitioners		80,000
Other Plaza & Cemetery expenses		115,051
FNSB added 1st year replacement costs for City's vehicle fleet		971,750
Other miscellanies increase and decreases		<u>90,323</u>
<b>Total Major Changes</b>	<b>23.18</b>	<b>\$ 717,471</b>

Appendix B is a table depicting the personnel and cost differences between the FNSB Response Budget, by department and function, and the revised budget of the Petitioners. The format of Appendix B is similar to tables in the Petitioners' Revised Budget submittal.

Appendix C is a schedule listing an explanation of the major changes between the FNSB Response Budget and the Petitioners' Revised Budget.

A review of the revenues in FNSB's Response Budget shows that the major revenue changes are in property taxes (see table as follows), the allocation of Hotel-Motel to Areawide purposes, and the making Solid Waste Collections an Areawide function, thus

eliminating the Solid Waste Collection tax levy. The FNSB's Response did eliminate several revenues, which should have been eliminated in the Petitioners' Response, which are the Health Center Maintenance of \$48,000 and City Garbage Collection-tipping fees. Both of these revenues are double counted in the Petitioners' budget, thus should be dropped.

**FNSB Response – Tax Levies in FY 2001 (a)**

Taxing Jurisdiction	Current Borough (FNSB) & City	Taxes in FNSB New Consolidation Budget	Difference	Reason
				Hotel-Motel Tax used for Areawide purposes and moving Solid Waste Collections to Areawide, decreases the total Areawide and SW Collections levy
FNSB-Areawide	52,542,510	53,699,687	1,157,177	
FNSB-Solid Waste Collection District	3,111,120		(3,111,120)	See note above
Non-Areawide	1,275,790	1,743,159	467,369	City EMS moved to Non-Areawide
New-City (Urban) Service Area (b)	<u>6,725,054</u>	<u>8,738,874</u>	<u>2,013,820</u>	Hotel-Motel Tax no longer used for City (Urban) Service Area purposes and increase of expenditures
<b>Total</b>	63,654,474	64,181,720	527,246	Additional taxes over current levy

(a) Excludes taxes for Transition Costs

(b) In Current column, the current City taxes are found in the Approved Budget - instead the FNSB Response listed the City taxes as \$6,639,373 or \$85,681 lower than in the Approved Budget

**PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION FY 2001 BUDGET -- EXPENDITURE DETAIL ROLL-UP**

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION SECTION	FNSB		FY 2001 MUNI OF FBKS			
	APPROVED		CONSOLIDATION		Proposed Consolidation	
	FY 2000-01 Budget		CHANGES		FY 2000-01 Budget	
	Costs	FTE	Costs	FTE	Costs	FTE
<b>PROPOSED AREA-WIDE BUDGET</b>						
<b>DEPT: ASSEMBLY</b>						
Div: Assembly Summary	359,350	11.00	-	-	359,350	11.000
Div: Clerk	450,300	6.00	-	-	450,300	6.000
Div: Records Management	93,700	1.00	-	-	93,700	1.000
Div: Records Management consolidation			64,510	1.10	64,510	1.100
Div: Elections	132,240	0.00	-	-	132,240	-
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,035,590</b>	<b>18.00</b>	<b>64,510</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>1,100,100</b>	<b>19.100</b>
<b>DEPT: MAYOR</b>						
Div: Administration	545,190	5.00	11,729	0.30	556,919	5.300
Div: Personnel	292,940	4.00	-	-	292,940	4.000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>838,130</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>11,729</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>849,859</b>	<b>9.300</b>
						<b>9.20</b>
<b>DEPT: LAW</b>						
	612,180	5.30	-	-	612,180	5.300
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>612,180</b>	<b>5.30</b>	-	-	<b>612,180</b>	<b>5.300</b>
<b>DEPT: ASSESSING</b>						
	1,701,380	23.00	-	-	1,701,380	23.000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,701,380</b>	<b>23.00</b>	-	-	<b>1,701,380</b>	<b>23.000</b>
<b>DEPT: COMMUNITY PLANNING</b>						
Div: Administration	213,390	3.00	-	-	213,390	3.000
Div: Planning & Zoning	407,080	7.00	-	-	407,080	7.000
Div: Platting & Mapping	473,250	7.00	-	-	473,250	7.000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,093,720</b>	<b>17.00</b>	-	-	<b>1,093,720</b>	<b>17.000</b>
<b>DEPT: COMPUTER SERVICES</b>						
	1,723,680	16.00	-	-	1,723,680	16.000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,723,680</b>	<b>16.00</b>	-	-	<b>1,723,680</b>	<b>16.000</b>
<b>DEPT: DIRECT SERVICES</b>						
Div: Administration	96,810	1.18	-	-	96,810	1.175
Div: Animal Control	882,990	11.65	-	-	882,990	11.650
Div: Rural Services	257,200	3.58	-	-	257,200	3.580
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,237,000</b>	<b>16.41</b>	-	-	<b>1,237,000</b>	<b>16.405</b>
<b>DEPT: EMERGENCY OPERATIONS</b>						
Div: Emergency Mgmt	74,720	0.55	-	-	74,720	0.550
Div: Enhanced 911	313,720	0.10	-	-	313,720	0.100
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>388,440</b>	<b>1.38</b>	-	-	<b>388,440</b>	<b>0.650</b>
<b>DEPT: FINANCIAL SERVICES</b>						
Div: Administration	284,150	3.00	-	-	284,150	3.000
Div: Accounting	1,061,390	14.95	-	-	1,061,390	14.950
Div: Child Care Assistance	3,270,170	6.70	-	-	3,270,170	6.700
Sec: Child Care	2,617,230	6.00	-	-	2,617,230	6.000
Sec: HSS Admin. (Spec. Rev)	652,940	0.70	-	-	652,940	0.700
Div: Risk Management	1,442,030	5.00	-	-	1,442,030	5.000
Div: Treasury/Budget	537,130	6.00	-	-	537,130	6.000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>6,594,870</b>	<b>35.65</b>	-	-	<b>6,594,870</b>	<b>35.650</b>
<b>DEPT: GENERAL SERVICES</b>						
Div: Administration	183,750	2.00	-	-	183,750	2.000
Div: Purchasing	140,140	2.50	-	-	140,140	2.500
Div: Support Services	720,460	3.00	-	-	720,460	3.000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,044,350</b>	<b>7.50</b>	-	-	<b>1,044,350</b>	<b>7.500</b>
<b>DEPT: LIBRARY SERVICES</b>						
Div: Administration	343,230	4.00	-	-	343,230	4.000
Div: Automated Services	285,210	3.00	-	-	285,210	3.000
Div: Collection Services	1,038,520	11.50	-	-	1,038,520	11.500
Div: Outreach Services	343,560	8.00	-	-	343,560	8.000
Div: Public Services	1,154,770	22.85	-	-	1,154,770	22.850
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>3,165,290</b>	<b>49.35</b>	-	-	<b>3,165,290</b>	<b>49.350</b>
<b>DEPT: PARKS &amp; RECREATION</b>						
Div: Administration	217,990	2.75	-	-	217,990	2.750
Div: Alaskaland	810,010	6.00	-	-	810,010	6.000
Div: Aquatics	879,920	14.67	-	-	879,920	14.670
Div: Comm Activity Ctr (CAC)	496,110	0.25	-	-	496,110	0.250
Div: Parks Maintenance	1,409,480	13.15	-	-	1,409,480	13.150
Div: Parks Maintenance-Golden Heart Plaza			99,365	0.35	99,365	0.350
Div: Parks Maintenance-Cemetaries			68,022	0.50	68,022	0.500
Div: Recreation Servs	672,210	11.61	-	-	672,210	11.610
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>4,485,720</b>	<b>48.43</b>	<b>167,387</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>4,653,107</b>	<b>49.280</b>

Appendix A

**PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION FY 2001 BUDGET -- EXPENDITURE DETAIL ROLL-UP**

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION SECTION	FNSB		FY 2001 MUNI OF FBKS			
	APPROVED		CONSOLIDATION		Proposed Consolidation	
	FY 2000-01 Budget		CHANGES		FY 2000-01 Budget	
	Costs	FTE	Costs	FTE	Costs	FTE
<b>DEPT: LAND MANAGEMENT</b>						
Div: Land Management	751,170	9.00	-	-	751,170	9.000
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>751,170</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>751,170</b>	<b>9.000</b>
<b>DEPT: PUBLIC WORKS</b>						
Div: Administration	213,440	2.00	-	-	213,440	2.000
Div: Design & Construction	615,220	16.00	-	-	615,220	16.000
Div: Facilities Maint.	2,712,840	15.00	-	-	2,712,840	15.000
Div: Facilities Maint. Health Ctr Consolidation			48,000	0.50	48,000	0.500
Div: Solid Waste Collections	3,036,770	1.66	-	-	3,036,770	1.660
Div: Solid Waste Collections Consolidation			318,600	-	318,600	-
Div: Solid Waste Disposal	2,406,460	14.84	-	-	2,406,460	14.840
Sec: Disposal	2,084,430	12.18	-	-	2,084,430	12.180
Sec: Household Hazardous Waste	322,030	2.66	-	-	322,030	2.660
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>8,984,730</b>	<b>49.50</b>	<b>366,600</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>9,351,330</b>	<b>50.000</b>
<b>DEPT: TRANSPORTATION</b>						
Div: Administration	168,180	2.00	-	-	168,180	2.000
Div: Air Quality Prog Summary	491,670	6.00	-	-	491,670	6.000
Sec: Air Quality - I/M	-	0.00	-	-	-	-
Sec: Air Quality - Monitoring	-	0.00	-	-	-	-
Div: Transit	1,116,490	14.30	-	-	1,116,490	14.300
Div: Van Tran	444,720	11.36	-	-	444,720	11.360
Div: Vehicle Fleet Maint	392,630	3.20	-	-	392,630	3.200
Div: Vehicle Fleet Fund (replacement)	914,140	-	-	-	914,140	-
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>3,527,830</b>	<b>36.86</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,527,830</b>	<b>36.860</b>
<b>Interfund Charges</b>						
Dir: Svcs - Enhanced 911	20,800	-	-	-	20,800	-
Land Management	228,780	-	-	-	228,780	-
Parks & Rec - Community Activity Center	316,680	-	-	-	316,680	-
Public Wks - Solid Waste Collections	95,050	-	-	-	95,050	-
Public Wks - Solid Waste Disposal	418,250	-	-	-	418,250	-
Public Wks - Household Hazardous Waste	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transportation - Administration	46,650	-	-	-	46,650	-
Transportation - Air Quality Monitoring Program	89,620	-	-	-	89,620	-
Transportation - Transit	147,200	-	-	-	147,200	-
Transportation - Van Tran	68,730	-	-	-	68,730	-
Transportation - Vehicle Fleet Maintenance	175,610	-	-	-	175,610	-
Transportation - Vehicle Replacement	35,390	-	-	-	35,390	-
General Fund to Land (cost is part of GF non-dept budget)	49,680	-	-	-	49,680	-
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,692,440</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,692,440</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>DEBT SERVICE</b>						
Debt Service - Areawide	11,283,040	-	-	-	11,283,040	-
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>11,283,040</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,283,040</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>EDUCATION</b>	32,045,700	-	-	-	32,045,700	-
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>32,045,700</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>32,045,700</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>CAPITAL BUDGET</b>						
Cap Budget, G.F. CIP	1,514,120	-	-	-	1,514,120	-
Cap Budget, NAW, Spec. Rev. Proj	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cap Budget, CAC CIP	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cap Budget, FSA's Projects	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cap Budget, Landfill Closure	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cap Budget, SW CIP & Spec. Rev	640,000	-	-	-	640,000	-
Cap Budget, Transit Projects	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>2,154,120</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,154,120</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</b>						
Specialized Evaluations	50,000	-	-	-	50,000	-
Health Center Maintenance	25,000	-	-	-	25,000	-
IGCP charges from Land Mgmt	-	-	-	-	-	-
Benefit 5% Contingency	158,130	-	-	-	158,130	-
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>233,130</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>233,130</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>TOTAL AREA WIDE:</b>	<b>84,592,510</b>	<b>321.07</b>	<b>610,226</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>85,202,736</b>	<b>344.395</b>

Adds to 341.64

Adds to 2.65

Adds to 344.29

Appendix A

**PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION FY 2001 BUDGET -- EXPENDITURE DETAIL ROLL-UP**

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION SECTION	FNSB		FY 2001 MUNI OF FBKS			
	APPROVED		CONSOLIDATION		Proposed Consolidation	
	FY 2000-01 Budget		CHANGES		FY 2000-01 Budget	
	Costs	FTE	Costs	FTE	Costs	FTE
<b>NON-AREAWIDE FUND BUDGET</b>						
Div: Economic Development	125,130	1.00	-	-	125,130	1.000
Interfund Charges Mayor - Economic Development	13,240		-		13,240	
Div: Community Research	65,150	1.00	-	-	65,150	1.000
Interfund Charges Com. Planning - Community Research	33,020		-		33,020	
Div: Emergency Medical Serv	1,033,250	0.73	1,042,369	10.00	2,075,619	10.725
Interfund Charges Dir. Svcs - Emergency Medical Services	154,700		-		154,700	
Cap Bdg't, NAW Projects	51,000		-		51,000	
Debt Service - Non-Areawide	257,570		-		257,570	
<b>TOTAL NON-AREAWIDE:</b>	<b>1,733,060</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>1,042,369</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>2,775,429</b>	<b>12.725</b>
<b>TOTAL AREAWIDE &amp; NON-AREAWIDE BUDGETS</b>	<b>86,325,570</b>	<b>344.37</b>	<b>1,652,595</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>87,978,165</b>	<b>344.395</b>
<b>PROPOSED URBAN SERVICE AREA BUDGET</b>						
Assembly Consolidation			45,000		45,000	
Assembly / Clerk Consolidation			26,800		26,800	
Assembly / Elections Consolidation			27,000		27,000	
Mayor / Personnel Consolidation			92,715	1.60	92,715	1.600
Law Consolidation			554,070	5.67	554,070	5.670
Computer Services I/S Consolidation			466,523	4.00	466,523	4.000
Computer Svcs Network Consolidation			74,372	1.00	74,372	1.000
Direct Svc Administration - Consolidation			31,760	0.63	31,760	0.630
Finance / Accounting Consolidation			218,320	3.50	218,320	3.500
Finance / Risk Management Consolidation			929,490	2.00	929,490	2.000
Finance / Treasury/Budget Consolidation			188,591	3.00	188,591	3.000
General Services / Purchasing Consolidation			103,898	1.50	103,898	1.500
General Services / Support Services Consolidation			280,296	1.00	280,296	1.000
Public Works / Facilities Maint. Utilities Consolidation			311,000		311,000	
Public Works/Solid Waste Disposal City Garbage Billing & Cust. Svc.			62,926	1.00	62,926	1.000
Transportation / Vehicle Fleet Maint Consolidation			838,755	6.00	838,755	6.000
Transportation / Vehicle Fleet Fund (replacement) Consolidation			971,750		971,750	
Cap Budget, Urban Service Area Projects			1,308,022		1,308,022	
FNA, SSA, Contingency Consolidation (City)			81,500		81,500	
Div: Urbans Svc Area Administration			951,610	9.63	951,610	9.630
Div: Police			5,368,085	58.00	5,368,085	58.000
Div: Fire			2,983,122	31.00	2,983,122	31.000
Div: Parking Garage/Authority			42,500		42,500	
Div: Building Inspections			465,736	6.00	465,736	6.000
Div: Engineering			1,025,488	15.00	1,025,488	15.000
Div: Street Lighting & Traffic Signal			460,000		460,000	
Div: Urban Svc Area Property Management			117,104		117,104	
Div: City Public Works			2,493,314	28.00	2,493,314	28.000
<b>TOTAL URBAN SERVICE AREA:</b>			<b>20,519,747</b>	<b>178.53</b>	<b>20,519,747</b>	<b>178.530</b>
<b>PROPOSED TRANSITION BUDGET</b>						
Hard & Soft Transition Costs			5,118,105		5,118,105	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>86,325,570</b>	<b>344.37</b>	<b>27,290,447</b>	<b>178.56</b>	<b>113,616,017</b>	<b>522.925</b>

Adds to 12.65

Adds to 357.02

Adds to 191.18

Adds to 535.55

**ROLL-UP RECONCILIATION OF SECTION 2 TO SECTIONS 3 AND 4**

FNSB Expenditure Totals per Sections 3 and 4:  
Existing Borough Service Areas (Road, Fire, etc.)  
Subtotal:  
Split Into Areawide and Non-Areawide:

	89,682,110
	(5,249,940)
	<u>84,432,170</u>
<b>Areawide</b>	82,900,070
<b>Interfunds:</b>	1,692,440
<b>Totals for Areawide and Non-Areawide in Section 2:</b>	<u>84,592,510</u>
<b>Non-Areawide</b>	1,532,100
	200,960
	<u>1,733,060</u>

**Appendix B. FNSB Response Budget Compared to Petitioners' Revised Budget**

	<b>Positions</b>			<b>Expenditures</b>		
Department	FNSB's Response Positions (FTE's)	Response Positions over FNSB base budget	Difference - FNSB Response to Petitioners'	FNSB's Response Expenditures	Response Expenditures over FNSB Base	Difference - FNSB's Response to Petitioners'
<b>DEPARTMENTS WITH FUNCTIONS BEING CONSOLIDATED</b>						
<b>ELECTED OFFICIALS</b>						
Div: Elected Officials	11.00		-	404,350	45,000	30,000
Div: Clerk's Office			-			
Sec. Clerk	6.00		(1.00)	477,100	26,800	(37,555)
Sec. Records Management	2.10	1.10	1.10	158,210	64,510	64,510
Sec. Elections			-	159,240	27,000	27,000
<b>MAYOR</b>						
Div: Administration	14.83	9.83	8.83	872,329	327,139	224,769
Div: Economic Development	1.00		-	125,130		-
Div: Personnel	5.60	1.60	0.60	385,655	92,715	38,141
<b>LAW</b>	10.97	5.67	1.67	1,166,250	554,070	92,149
<b>FINANCIAL SERVICES</b>						
Div: Administration	3.00		-	284,150		(7,000)
Div: Accounting	18.45	3.50	1.50	1,279,710	218,320	101,270
Div: Child Care (Sec.)	6.00		-	2,617,230		-
Div: HHS Administration (Sec.)	0.70		-	652,940		-
Div: Risk Management	7.00	2.00	1.00	2,371,520	929,490	275,878
Div: Treasury Budget	9.00	3.00	1.50	725,721	188,591	92,322
<b>COMPUTER SERVICES</b>	21.00	5.00	4.00	2,264,575	540,895	389,293



**Appendix B. FNSB Response Budget Compared to Petitioners' Revised Budget**

Department	Positions			Expenditures		
	FNSB's Response Positions (FTE's)	Response Positions over FNSB base budget	Difference - FNSB Response to Petitioners'	FNSB's Response Expenditures	Response Expenditures over FNSB Base	Difference - FNSB's Response to Petitioners'
<b>GENERAL SERVICES</b>						
Div: Administration	2.00		-	183,750		
Div: Purchasing	4.00	1.50	0.50	244,038	103,898	56,265
Div: Support Services	4.00	1.00	-	1,000,756	280,296	50,234
<b>DEPARTMENTS WITH SOME CONSOLIDATION OF FUNCTIONS</b>						
<b>PUBLIC WORKS</b>						
Div: Administration	2.00		(2.00)	213,440		(143,024)
Div: Bldg. Inspection (Sec)	6.00	6.00	-	465,736	465,736	4,680
Div.: Design & Construction	31.00	15.00	1.00	1,640,708	1,025,488	69,104
Div: Maintenance-Facilities	15.50	0.50	0.50	3,231,444	518,604	42,500
Div: Main't-Roads & Drainage	28.00	28.00	(6.00)	2,953,314	2,953,314	(1,006,707)
Div: SW Collections (Sec)	1.66		(0.50)	3,355,370	318,600	(23,231)
Div: SW Disposal (Sec)	13.18	1.00	1.00	2,147,356	62,926	62,926
Div: SW Household Haz Waste	2.66		-	322,030		-
<b>EMERGENCY OPERATIONS</b>						
Div: Emergency Mgmt	0.55		-	74,720		-
Div: Emergency Medical Serv	10.73	10.00	10.00	2,075,619	1,042,369	986,869
Div: Enhanced 911	0.10		-	313,720		-
<b>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</b>				950,830	81,500	(1,931,629)
<b>DEPARTMENTS WITH STAND ALONE FUNCTIONS (no counterpart at City or Borough)</b>						
<b>ASSESSING</b>	23.00		-	1,701,380		-

**Appendix B. FNSB Response Budget Compared to Petitioners' Revised Budget**

Department	Positions			Expenditures		
	FNSB's Response Positions (FTE's)	Response Positions over FNSB base budget	Difference - FNSB Response to Petitioners'	FNSB's Response Expenditures	Response Expenditures over FNSB Base	Difference - FNSB's Response to Petitioners'
<b>COMMUNITY PLANNING</b>						
Div: Administration	3.00		-	213,390		-
Div: Community Research	1.00		-	65,150		-
Div: Planning & Zoning	7.00		-	407,080		-
Div: Platting & Mapping	7.00		-	473,250		-
<b>DIRECT SERVICES</b>						
Div: Administration	1.805	0.63	0.63	128,570	31,760	31,760
Div: Animal Control	11.65		-	882,990		-
Div: Rural Services	3.58		-	257,200		-
<b>LIBRARY SERVICES</b>						
Div: Administration	4.00		-	343,230		-
Div: Automated Services	3.00		-	285,210		-
Div: Collection Services	11.50		-	1,038,520		-
Div: Outreach Services	8.00		-	343,560		-
Div: Public Services	22.85		-	1,154,770		-
<b>PARKS &amp; RECREATION</b>						
Div: Administration	2.75			217,990		-
Div: Alaskaland	6.00			810,010		-
Div: Aquatics	14.67			879,920		-
Div: Comm Activity Ctr (CAC)	0.25			496,110		-
Div: Parks Maintenance	14.00	0.85	0.85	1,576,867	167,387	167,387
Div: Recreation Servs	11.61		-	672,210		-
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>						
Div: Administration	2.00			168,180		-
Div: Air Quality Prog Summary	6.00			491,670		-
Div: Transit	14.30			1,116,490		-
Div: Van Tran	11.36			444,720		-
Div: Vehicle Fleet Maint	9.20	6.00	6.00	1,231,385	838,755	838,755
Div: Vehicle Fleet Fund (replacement)				1,885,890	971,750	971,750
<b>LAND MANAGEMENT</b>	9.00		-	751,170		-

**Appendix B. FNSB Response Budget Compared to Petitioners' Revised Budget**

Department	Positions			Expenditures		
	FNSB's Response Positions (FTE's)	Response Positions over FNSB base budget	Difference - FNSB Response to Petitioners'	FNSB's Response Expenditures	Response Expenditures over FNSB Base	Difference - FNSB's Response to Petitioners'
<b>POLICE</b>	58.00	58.00	1.00	5,368,085	5,368,085	111,399
<b>FIRE</b>	31.00	31.00	(9.00)	2,983,122	2,983,122	(862,345)
<b>INTERGOVERNMENTAL CHARGES</b>				1,893,400		-
<b>DEBT SERVICE</b>						
Areawide				11,283,040		-
Non-Areawide				257,570		-
<b>CAPITAL</b>				3,513,142	1,308,022	-
<b>EDUCATION</b>				32,045,700		
	<b>535.555</b>	<b>191.18</b>	<b>23.175</b>	<b>108,497,912</b>	<b>21,536,142</b>	<b>717,471</b>

**Points of Importance:**

\* Expenses not separated in Petitioners' Budget; majority are shown in Non-Departmental

Used City Salaries - Petitioner used FNSB Salaries

Transition Costs are excluded in this comparison

Error in Summary Schedule for Personnel Counts

Economic Development Grants not budgeted

No economies of scale in insurance & bonding purchasing assumed

Cashiering for City (Urban) Service Area budgeted in T/B for an additional 1/2 FTE and in Urban Service area for 2.0 FTE's

Vehicle Replacements added for \$931,750

Five Board of Supervisors added for Urban Service Area

Departmental

FNSB prepared a line-item budget

Attorney staff increased as well as Risk increased for Safety & Claims Administrator

Purchasing Clerks salary & benefits (1.5 FTE's) included for \$100,698: it should be approx. \$70,710

**Appendix C. Comparison of FNSB Response Budget to Petitioners' Consolidation Budget**

Department/Division	Explanation of Major Change from Petitioners' Budget	Personnel Differences	Major Expenditure Differences	Total of Major Differences
<b>DEPARTMENTS WITH FUNCTIONS BEING CONSOLIDATED</b>				
<b>ELECTED OFFICIALS</b>				
Div: Elected Officials	Additional Audit Fees		30,000	
Div: Clerk's Office	No Clerical Added; less other items	(1.00)	(57,555)	
	Code Supplement Added		20,000	
Sec. Records Management	Cemetery Recordingkeeping & Records' Clerk added	1.10	64,510	
Sec. Elections	City (Urban) Service Area Elections costs added		27,000	83,955
<b>MAYOR</b>				
Div: Administration	No Special Assistant & reduction in temp. salaries	(1.00)	(98,870)	
	Increased clerical for Liquor Licensing	0.20	11,729	
	New Board of Supervisors	5.00		
	City (Urban) Service Area: Administrator; 2/3 Secretary, Cashier; Collections' & Billing Clerk & Typist	4.63	293,280	
	Other Items in City (Urban) Service Area Administration budget		18,630	
Div: Economic Development				
Div: Personnel	Increased in staffing by .60 FTE	0.60	34,851	
	Increase in other line-items		3,290	262,910
<b>LAW</b>				
	Added Attorney & support staff	1.67	150,000	
	No additional contractual Attorney services budgeted		(75,000)	
	Increases in other line-items		17,149	92,149
<b>FINANCIAL SERVICES</b>				
Div: Administration	Decrease in items budgeted in FNSB Response in Accounting		(7,000)	
Div: Accounting	Increased Accounting positions by 1.5 FTE's	1.50	99,683	
	FICA Admin.		(1,500)	
	Increases in other line-items		3,087	
Div: Child Care (Sec.)				
Div: HHS Administration (Sec.)				
Div: Risk Management	Increase new Safety & Claims Administrator position = 1.0 FTE's	1.00	50,473	
	Claims Adjustor contract		20,000	
	Industrial Hygienist contract		3,000	
	Increase in Insurance & Bonding costs		168,035	
	OSHA Training		30,000	
	Increases in other line-items		4,370	

**Appendix C. Comparison of FNSB Response Budget to Petitioners' Consolidation Budget**

Department/Division	Explanation of Major Change from Petitioners' Budget	Personnel Differences	Major Expenditure Differences	Total of Major Differences
Div: Treasury Budget	Tax & Cash Auditor position added & 1/2 Cashier added = 1.5 FTE's added	1.50	89,133	
	Increases in other line-items		3,189	462,470
<b>COMPUTER SERVICES</b>	An additional 4.0 FTE's added, including Director	4.00	390,963	
	Less other computer related costs added		(1,670)	389,293
<b>GENERAL SERVICES</b>				
Div: Administration				
Div: Purchasing	An additional 1/2 Purchasing Clerk added	0.50	53,565	
	Increases in other line-items		2,700	
Div: Support Services	Decrease in Clerk's salary & benefits to match City budget		(6,167)	
	Adjust to balance to City's Approved budget for telephone		(60,000)	
	Increases in other line-items		116,402	106,500
<b>DEPARTMENTS WITH SOME CONSOLIDATION OF FUNCTIONS</b>				
<b>PUBLIC WORKS</b>				
Div: Administration	Ass't Director and Secretary position not added in FNSB response, and associated supplies & training not added	(2.00)	(135,524)	
	Associated supplies & training not added		(7,500)	
Div: Bldg. Inspection (Sec)	Copier lease not moved to General Services as in Petitioners' budget		4,680	
Div.: Design & Construction	Add back 1.0 FTE transferred to Admin. Division in Petitioners' budget	1.00	69,104	
Div: Maintenance-Facilities	Added .5 positions for Health Center Maintenance & associated costs	0.50	42,500	
Div: Main't-Roads & Drainage	Did not add Temp salaries & benefits to tie to City's Approved Budget		(94,500)	
	Did not add commodities to tie to City's Approved Budget		(34,352)	
	Added back vehicle leases that FNSB Response deleted from City's Budget		(40,000)	
	Transfer of funds & 6.0 FTE's to Transportation: Vehicle Maintenance (remained in Petitioners' Budget in this Division)	(6.00)	(838,755)	
	Added Trash Recepticals		4,900	
	Less: State Parking Garage not moved from City's General Account as in Petitioners' budget		(15,000)	
	Telephone & fax charges not moved to General Services as in Petitioners' budget		11,000	
Div: SW Collections (Sec)	Collections & Billing Clerk 1/2 shown in Disposal in FNSB Response	(0.50)	(23,231)	
Div: SW Disposal (Sec)	1.0 FTE Collections & Billing Clerk (1/2 more than Petitioners' budget)	1.00	53,122	
	Other collections & billing items added		9,804	
Div: SW Household Haz Waste				(993,752)

**Appendix C. Comparison of FNSB Response Budget to Petitioners' Consolidation Budget**

Department/Division	Explanation of Major Change from Petitioners' Budget	Personnel Differences	Major Expenditure Differences	Total of Major Differences
<b>EMERGENCY OPERATIONS</b>				
Div: Emergency Mgmt				
Div: Emergency Medical Serv	EMS staff transferred from City Fire Dept. = 10 FTE	10.00	884,139	
	Other costs transferred from City Fire Budget		102,730	
Div: Enhanced 911				986,869
<b>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</b>	Contributions to Other Agencies - not budgeted		(1,983,629)	
	Fbks Parking Authority - City (Urban) Service Area		(27,500)	
	Special Assmet Projects - City (Urban) Service Area		(7,500)	
	Operating Transfer to Debt Service, City (Urban) Service Area		(2,000)	
	Charges to Permanent Fund Capital, City (Urban) Service Area		17,500	
	Sludge Engineering Labor - Public Works		(10,000)	
	FICA Admin, budgeted by Petitioners' in Financial Services, Accounting		1,500	
	Contingency - not budgeted		80,000	(1,931,629)
<b>DEPARTMENTS WITH STAND ALONE FUNCTIONS (no counterpart at City or Borough)</b>				
<b>ASSESSING</b>				
<b>COMMUNITY PLANNING</b>				
Div: Administration				
Div: Community Research				
Div: Planning & Zoning				
Div: Platting & Mapping				
<b>DIRECT SERVICES</b>				
Div: Administration	Increases clerical support .63 FTE	0.63	29,540	
	Other misc. costs increases		2,220	
Div: Animal Control				
Div: Rural Services				31,760
<b>LIBRARY SERVICES</b>				
Div: Administration				
Div: Automated Services				
Div: Collection Services				
Div: Outreach Services				
Div: Public Services				

**Appendix C. Comparison of FNSB Response Budget to Petitioners' Consolidation Budget**

Department/Division	Explanation of Major Change from Petitioners' Budget	Personnel Differences	Major Expenditure Differences	Total of Major Differences
<b>PARKS &amp; RECREATION</b>				
Div: Administration				
Div: Alaskaland				
Div: Aquatics				
Div: Comm Activity Ctr (CAC)				
Div: Parks Maintenance	New Maintenance staffing for Golden Heart Plaza and Cemeteries	0.85	52,336	
	Other Plaza & Cemetery expenses		115,051	
Div: Recreation Servs				167,387
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>				
Div: Administration				
Div: Air Quality Prog Summary				
Div: Transit				
Div: Van Tran				
Div: Vehicle Fleet Maint	FNSB moved staff and costs for vehicle maintenance to Transportation Dept.	6.00	838,755	
Div: Vehicle Fleet Fund (Replacement)	FNSB added 1st year replacement costs for City's vehicle fleet		971,750	1,810,505
<b>LAND MANAGEMENT</b>				
<b>POLICE</b>	FNSB Response overstates City's Approved Budget	1.00	111,399	111,399
<b>FIRE</b>	FNSB Response added a new position of Fire Chief	1.00	113,600	
	FNSB Response moved EMS staff and costs to EMS under Emergency Management	(10.00)	(884,139)	
	FNSB Response moved EMS costs to EMS under Emergency Mgt.		(102,230)	
	FNSB Response did not add \$500 for EMS billings & collections		(500)	
	FNSB Response did not tie to City's Approved Budget		10,924	(862,345)
			(862,345)	
<b>INTERGOVERNMENTAL CHARGES</b>				
<b>DEBT SERVICE</b>				
Areawide				
Non-Areawide				
<b>CAPITAL</b>				
<b>EDUCATION</b>				
	<b>Total Changes ---&gt;</b>	<b>23.18</b>		<b>717,471</b>